

The Evening World.

ESTABLISHED BY JOSEPH PULITZER.
Published Daily Except Sunday by the Evening World Publishing Company, Inc., 55 to 60 Park Row, New York.
RALPH PULITZER, President, 60 Park Row.
J. ANGELO SHAW, Treasurer, 60 Park Row.
JOSEPH PULITZER, Jr., Secretary, 60 Park Row.

MEMBERS OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS.
The Associated Press is exclusively entitled to the use for republication of all news dispatches credited to it or not otherwise credited in this paper and also the local news collected here.

IRELAND AND THE LEAGUE.

IN the interview printed yesterday in The Evening World, Gov. Cox of Ohio ventured on the ordinarily dangerous ground of the Irish question. His statements are so full of good common sense, and therefore so different from the usual political treatment of the subject, that they deserve careful consideration.

Gov. Cox is frankly sympathetic with Ireland and the Irish cause. But he sees in this a good reason why the United States should join the League of Nations. He said:

"The status of the Irish people will, I believe, be promoted by the League of Nations. The League would permit them to present their case to the conscience of the whole world."

This is precisely the reverse of the attitude assumed by most politicians angling for the "Irish vote." These have held out vague promises of recognition and even aid to the Irish Republic. These have sought popularity by the familiar and time-worn device of "twisting the lion's tail"—at a safe distance.

The plain, unvarnished truth of the matter is:

The United States will not go to war with Great Britain even for an object so dear to the heart of many Americans as the freeing of Ireland.

This being true, the most effective help to Ireland would be rendered through the League of Nations, in which the United States could exercise all the friendly pressure which could be mobilized in all the nations of the world—including the British colonies and dominions.

Hypocritical and political resolutions of sympathy will not free Ireland. Not even recognition of Irish independence will free Ireland. But once the United States is in the League of Nations its representative can be instructed to act as a focal point for the concentration of the opinion of the world, which in the main sympathizes with the rights of the Irish.

Isn't it about time that Irish sympathizers came down to earth and ceased to allow demagogues to play on their hatred for England with half promises that the demagogues know can never be fulfilled?

Isn't it about time Irish sympathizers took account of what may and may not be done and exerted their influence in the only way that promises any measure of success?

Jurists at Hague Favor Root's Plan—

Headline.

If the Republican Party must have something it can point to as proof that the League of Nations has been Republicanized, why not point to Mr. Root?

SOMETHING TO SHOW FOR IT.

REPORTS of the Citizens' Transportation Committee indicate an increase in the amount of freight moved, even though the new effort has cleared only a trifling fraction of the material congesting the piers.

Even more gratifying would be a report of the introduction of improved methods of moving the freight.

Sooner or later New York must follow the lead of more progressive cities and install something approximating a common carrier system of intracity freighting which will facilitate and cheapen transport cost by attaining the closest possible approach to 100 per cent. efficiency in the use of transfer equipment.

This involves the use of standardized motor trucks equipped with removable and interchangeable bodies which may be loaded and unloaded without interrupting use of the motor.

The Merchants' Association is already on record as favoring such an innovation. In purchasing equipment the Transportation Committee should exercise progressive and constructive judgment.

Then, whatever the outcome of the industrial dispute which called the committee into being, it would have something to show for the money it is spending.

CHINA'S PASSIVE RESISTANCE.

SEVERAL diplomatic notes in regard to Shantung have passed between the Japanese and Chinese Governments. Publication of the correspondence reveals Japan almost in the role of petitioner. There is hardly a note of the lordly dominance commonly associated with military success.

Here is a phenomenon which the lords of the earth, the jingoes, the Security Leagues and the like may well ponder.

It was only a few years ago that "Chinatified" was a term of contempt and derision. America was warned of the helplessness of China as an example and a warning.

What is it that the Chinese have done to win what promises to be a bloodless victory over Japan? How have the Chinese tamed the powerful Island Empire?

Military strength did not defeat Japan. China seems to have used weapons even more powerful.

A dignified appeal to the public conscience of the

world backed by a national unity in the use of the economic weapon of the boycott have been the effective weapons which China has tried.

China believed its cause was just. It refused to compromise or to submit to compromise. Even now when the victory is almost won it refuses to compromise on anything less than the full right and justice of the case as the Chinese see it.

Before 1914 a few dreamers and idealists advocated passive resistance and economic and social non-intercourse as the most effective defense against aggression. They were laughed at as fools. But China's action against Japan lends strong support to prove their case.

LESSONS OF HISTORY.

SPEAKING at the centennial of the Harvard Law School yesterday, Charles E. Hughes declared that, as a Nation, "our material progress seems to have created complexities beyond our political competency, and, disregarding the lessons of history, there has been a disposition to revert to the methods of tyranny in order to meet the problems of democracy."

"We went to war for liberty and democracy, with the result that we fed the autocratic appetite, and through a fiction permissible only because the courts cannot know what every one else knows we have seen the war powers which are essential to the preservation of the Nation in time of war exercised broadly after the military exigency had passed and in conditions for which they were never intended."

Mr. Hughes would hardly deny that the lessons of history, if they teach anything, teach us not only that the United States cannot go to war without seriously disturbing the balance that normally exists between the constitutionally established branches of its Government, but that it is NOT beyond the capacity of the people of the United States to restore that balance even though it remains uneven for some time after the war that has disturbed it is ended.

When the United States goes to war the Federal authority in general and the authority of the President in particular are startlingly, momentarily extended.

Yet, during the Civil War, Abraham Lincoln stretched his executive authority to the point of suspending the writ of habeas corpus and issuing the Emancipation Proclamation, and, following the Civil War, Federal authority continued to be exerted to an unwonted degree over an unsettled country—without imperilling the Constitution by setting up permanent Federal tyranny or autocracy.

In that case it was a Republican Administration that had to take the responsibility and bear the onus of resolving itself into what many would call a war dictatorship.

Afterward when habits of Federal dictation formed during the war had to be laid aside it was the Democratic Party that emerged as the strongest reminder and corrective, with its traditional principles upholding State rights and opposing extension of the Federal authority.

When Mr. Hughes spoke at the Harvard Law School yesterday he was not making a political address. But there will be many Republicans in Mr. Hughes's party who will gladly interpret what he said as an arraignment of the present Democratic Administration for an alleged tyrannical prolongation of its war powers.

Mr. Hughes referred to such powers as having been "exercised broadly after the military exigency had passed and in conditions for which they were never intended."

How would the country have fared without the exercise of certain of these powers—those conferred by the Lever act for example—in the face of a Republican Congress which steadily refused reconstructive legislation to alleviate any post-war suffering which could be prolonged and laid at the door of a Democratic Administration for the purposes of a Presidential campaign?

Moreover, when it comes to "feeding the autocratic appetite," how do the two parties stand in that history the lessons of which Mr. Hughes says are now disregarded?

As the legitimate heir of Federalist principles, the Republican Party has always been the closer to the Hamilton idea of strong Federal authority and a sweeping exercise of Presidential powers.

On the other hand, if the Democratic Party inherited anything from Thomas Jefferson it inherited the Jeffersonian idea of individual freedom and local self-government as opposed to over-centralized authority.

That, assuredly, is history.

Who can remember back to the slang era when "Come off your porch" would have been a snappy campaign slogan?

"Previously," said Mrs. Abby Scott Baker, Suffragist leader at San Francisco, "we have not blamed the Democrats as we have the Republicans because we have taken the position of 'no got, no can do.'"

"Hours of ease" are going to have the same effect on woman in politics that the poet attributed to them long before Suffrage was thought of.

Handicapped!

Copyright, 1920,
by The Evening World, Inc.
(The New York Evening World.)

By J. H. Cassel



FROM EVENING WORLD READERS

What kind of letter do you find most readable? Isn't it the one that gives you the worth of a thousand words in a couple of hundred? There is fine mental exercise and a lot of satisfaction in trying to say much in a few words. Take time to be brief.

In Memory of a Benefactor.

To the Editor of The Evening World:
Would it not be appropriate to manifest our appreciation of the charitable efforts of the late GEORGE W. PERKINS to place Bear Mountain Park at the public's convenience by naming some mountain or lake or some other point of interest in Interstate Park in his honor? It is the least we can do to everlastingly preserve the memory of an American who so unselfishly dedicated his life for the preservation of the beauty of America's finest and most historic waterway, and for the comfort and pleasure of the Americans who enjoy its scenery. Who seconds the motion?

JAMES MONTGOMERY CLARK.
New York, June 21, 1920.

The Church Says "Welcome."

To the Editor of The Evening World:

I wonder why so few people attend church? Why do so many people deny themselves the social and spiritual advantages of attending church? A certain writer, describing a stranger's visit to a modern country, says: "I took him to a church and showed him the people at prayer, and told him what the preacher was saying. He turned to me and said, 'Here there are words of wisdom, but the hearers are few.' I then led him to one of our popular cabarets, and explained to him what was going on there, and told him what the chorus girls were singing. 'Here,' he remarked, 'are words of folly and wantonness, but the hearers are many.' Why do people deprive themselves of spiritual counsel when they can get it for the mere asking? Why do people spend nights at the theatre instead of going to church?" To all who mourn and need comfort, to all who are tired and need rest, to all who are friendless and need friendship, to all who are lonely and need companionship, to all who are homeless and need sheltering love, to all who pray and to all who do not, to all who sin and need a Saviour, and to all who will, the church opens wide its doors, and in the name of our Lord, says WELCOME. G. M. Brooklyn, June 16, 1920.

Give It a Trial.

To the Editor of The Evening World:

The title, "Pitiful Ignorance," which you gave the letter from H. Feldman, is most fitting. If this reader believed in our country keeping pace with the times and was not in favor of "standpatism," which would stunt the growth of the nation, he could not express himself in such a selfish manner.

Primarily the "League of Nations" was our object in the war, as a safeguard against involving the United States in any future wars wherein we have no personal interest, as was the case in the recent ones. Secondly our membership would be welcomed by the so-called "weak nations" of the world, who need the influence of a powerful and unselfish nation such as ours to champion, protect and safeguard their interests, whenever

they are in the right, so that they will not be subject to bullying by the powerful nations of Europe, as has been the method in the past. It is incomprehensible that if the League of Nations rendered a decision in an international dispute between two nations and thereby pledged all the members of the league to back up such ruling with arms that the nation losing the verdict, regardless of how mighty it might be, would invite national obliteration by acting contrary to such verdict.

By all means give the League of Nations a trial; it's a step in the right direction.
CONSTANT READER.
New York, June 20, 1920.

A Minority Law.

To the Editor of The Evening World:

In answer to Henry B. Moloney's letter in your edition of June 15, I will state that The Evening World is perfectly justified in the assertion that a minority and not a majority has forced and made the Eighteenth Amendment a part of our Constitution.

Can Mr. Moloney explain why our friends, the Prohibitionists, have blocked every effort of the majority to put the "dry" amendment to a referendum?

For the benefit of Mr. Moloney, I will answer the question as follows: Because they (the Prohibition forces) knew in such event the citizens throughout the country would have overwhelmingly declared in favor of a liberal "wet" law.

Let us hope and trust, for the benefit of all liberal thinking and liberty loving people, that some time the American people will elect a Congress that will be free to act in accordance with the wishes of the majority and not suffer under the lash of a few hypocrites, consisting of "Billy" Bryan and his cohorts, who ought to be deported from the land of the free and home of the brave.

A LEIDSON.
No. 187 St. Nicholas Avenue, June 20, 1920.

Consent the Y. M. C. A.

To the Editor of The Evening World:

I would like to get some information on automobile gas engine assembling.

Where can you get such instructions? Can a man get a position as apprentice in an automobile factory? What are the wages paid to a journeyman and apprentice?

OFFICE CLERK.
New York, June 20, 1920.

Prohibition and Americanism.

To the Editor of The Evening World:

I am not a Prohibitionist but I congratulate you on placing the article, "Says Prohibition Causes Shortage of Scrub Women," on your first page. I gladly acknowledge the worth and value of Prohibition when our poor, down-trodden women are elevated by the sobriety of what were formerly run-sodden husbands. I believe The Evening World will change its policy within a year and

UNCOMMON SENSE

By John Blake

(Copyright, 1920, by John Blake.)

BEWARE OF THE MAN WHO WHINES.

We have just received a whining, complaining letter from a correspondent who objects to a statement that this isn't a hard or a cruel world.

This person, palpably a failure, declares that there is no justice and no opportunity in the world, and that the successful are continually preying on the unsuccessful.

If what he said were true, Abraham Lincoln would never have been President of the United States, Lloyd George would still be an obscure Welsh lawyer, old man Clemenceau would be teaching French in a ladies' seminary in Stamford, Conn.

Instead of whining, as does this correspondent, these men set themselves to work to get something out of life.

They didn't deceive themselves with any idea that justice was to be expected, or that opportunity was to be passed around to them on silver platters.

They soon perceived that injustice abounds and that opportunity has to be made.

But instead of whining at their hard lot they managed to overcome injustice and to make opportunity.

There are of course millions of people who do not get a fair chance in life. Injustice is everywhere. The world abounds in crafty rascals ready to take advantage of the weak and the stupid.

But, notwithstanding all this, poor boys are making their way to the top right along, and will continue to do so while the world lasts.

They do not get discouraged with evidences of crookedness and greed. They make up their minds to get along in spite of these things, and they do.

With a single exception, the prominent railroad presidents of the United States are men who began their life work as very humble railroad employees. And the one exception admits that he is handicapped by never having held an overall job.

Nobody loves a whiner, and a whiner never gets along. The world is as it is. It is not altogether good, but it is good enough for the man who knows how to live in it.

If this correspondent finds it hard and cruel he is getting, for one, exact justice. For it ought to be hard and cruel to the whiner.

prove by statistics that Prohibition is the savior of our country. "The majority suffer with the few," but if we can better conditions of the drunkard and his family, I am for Prohibition.

Talk of being deprived of liberty! Bosh! We are leading the world in temperance and the "soaks" and moderate drinkers will admit the wisdom of our legislators in years to come.

We should also modify our cry, "America for Americans!" We are not a selfish race. Hundreds of thousands of imported laborers and workers till our soil, dig our coal and keep us alive. Many of our short-sighted people think we can live a secluded life independent of the rest of the world. Our country would fall behind rapidly were we to refrain from exporting and importing necessities of life. We cannot live alone. May as well

Who's Who In Making Laws For Nations

THIS (twelve distinguished international jurists, among them Elihu Root, invited by the Executive Council of the League of Nations to plan the organization of the new Permanent Court of International Justice, constitute an impressive array of the world's most competent authorities on questions of international legislation. Those who accepted the invitation gathered here in mid-June to undertake the task. Those invited were:

Baron Descamps, Belgian Minister of State, Professor of International Law at Louvain University, Member of the Permanent Court of Arbitration of The Hague, and Secretary-General, formerly President of the Institute of International Law, and writer on international questions.

M. Drago, formerly Foreign Minister of the Argentine Republic. While holding that office he sent to the Argentine Minister in Washington instructions known as the Drago Doctrine (1902). He was formerly Judge in Argentina, one of the arbitrators nominated by agreement between Great Britain and the United States in the North Atlantic Fisheries Arbitration, The Hague (1910); one of the Argentine delegates to the Second Peace Conference at The Hague and member of the Permanent Court of Arbitration of The Hague.

Prof. Fadda, professor of Roman law at Naples University.

M. Fromageot, legal adviser to the French Foreign Minister, member of the Permanent Court of Arbitration of The Hague and delegate to the second Hague Peace Conference.

M. Gram, formerly a Judge on the mixed tribunals in Egypt, former member of the Supreme Court of Norway, Minister of State at Stockholm, before the Peace Conference, the union between Norway and Sweden, member of the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague and member of the Institute of International Law.

Dr. Loder, member of the Cour de Cassation of the Netherlands.

Lord Phillimore, English Privy Counsellor, a Lord Justice of Appeal (1913-1918); President of the International Law Association (1905-1908); author of publications on ecclesiastical and international law and "Three Centuries of Treaties of Peace and Their Teaching" (1917); President of Committee of Inquiry appointed by the British Government on the subject of the League of Nations.

Elihu Root, former Secretary of State; President of the American Society of International Law; Member of the Permanent Court of Arbitration of The Hague, senior counsel for the United States in the North Atlantic Fisheries Arbitration at The Hague (1910); member of the Alaska Boundary Tribunal and head of special United States mission in Russia (1917).

M. Vesitch, Ambassador Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes at Paris.

Satomo Akiduki, formerly Japanese Ambassador to the United States, one of the legal advisers of Japanese Peace Delegation in Paris.

Rafael Altamira, professor of law in Madrid University; Senator. Clovis Bevilacqua, professor of law and legal adviser to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Brazil.

Leviathan Fire Detection System Revealed Crew Smoking After 'Lights Out'

THE Navy officers who commanded the Leviathan when that mighty ship was being used as a transport are still laughing over the humorous manner in which members of the crew were once caught breaking rules. For the men were caught smoking off duty "after the smoking light was out" as they say in naval parlance, which is to say that it was against the rules at that hour, and they were caught by means of the ship's fire detection system.

It appears that the men sought a lower hold far from the haunts of the officers on duty and there, believing themselves carefully concealed, they had begun smoking to their hearts' content. But the ship's fire detection system consisted of a series of pipes to the holds through which a suction fan was continually drawing air samples to the wheelhouse. Here the officer on duty noticed the curling wisps of smoke coming from the pipe to one of the lower holds. Not only that, but on investigating the smoke he noticed the old familiar odor of the demon nicotine itself.

Since the pipe line carrying the smoke was labelled it was a matter of moments to hurry down to the hold, catch the men in the act and ask them to smoke off extra duty, which, if it did not cure the longing for a smoke, at least temporarily, reformed them of smoking aboard ship. And the funny part of it was that for a long time after the hold was searched and the men were found, the officers were puzzled to know how the officer had traced them. The hold was near the bottom of the ship, far from the wheelhouse, and there was not another man within many yards of their position. They knew no officer had followed them and they thought at least that there was no direct communication between the hold and the wheelhouse. And no one enlightened them during many trips to France and back until one of the men happened to investigate the odd pipe-like "smoke collector" learned that it was the fire detecting system which had proved their undoing.

Coloration of Arc Lamp Globes.

IT is well known that arc lamp globes tend to assume a purple coloration under the action of light, a phenomenon due to the presence of manganese, which is used to counteract the greenish coloration which would otherwise take place owing to the effect of ferrous salts in the glass. Mr. M. Luckiesh, writing in a recent issue of the Electrical World, suggests that in specifications for arc globes it should be prescribed that no manganese is to be used. This would avoid the coloring effect (which may involve ultimately 50 per cent. absorption), and for outdoor globes the slight greenish coloration would not be of great consequence.

New York, June 17, 1920. YANKEE.